

**REMARKS****I. Status of the Claims**

Claims 133-135 and 137-142 have been examined, as claims 1-132, 136 and 143-194 stand withdrawn pursuant to a restriction requirement and election of species and are hereby canceled. Claims 140 and 141 are now amended in order to address claim dependency errors resulting from amendments offered in the response filed on May 27, 2003 and to direct the claims to subject matter indicated as enabled; claim 133 is amended to more clearly define the claimed invention.

**II. Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §112, First Paragraph**

Claims 133-135 and 137-142 are again rejected under the first paragraph of §112 as lacking enablement. Applicants traverse the rejection, but in the interest of advancing the prosecution, the claims have been amended to recite subject matter indicated as enabled, thereby reducing the number of issues on appeal. Therefore, applicants respectfully request entry of the amendment and reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection.


**III. Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §103**

Claims 133-135 and 137-142 are remain rejected under §103 as obvious over Sobol, Dong, Smith I and Smith II. Applicants have previously filed a Notice of Appeal and intend to respond to this issue by filing of a brief upon indication that the amendments to the claims have been entered. Therefore, applicants respectfully request that the examiner contact the undersigned as soon as the present amendments are entered.

**IV. Conclusion**

Entry of the foregoing amendment is respectfully requested. Should the examiner have any questions regarding this response, a telephone call to the undersigned is invited.

Respectfully submitted,

  
Steven L. Highlander  
Reg. No. 37,642  
Attorney for Applicants

FULBRIGHT & JAWORSKI L.L.P.  
600 Congress Avenue, Suite 2400  
Austin, Texas 78701  
(512) 474-5201

Date: August 23, 2004